

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-18 are pending. Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-18 stand rejected. Claims 1, 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 2-6, 9-11, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant respectfully points out that Examiner did not address the width limitations of claims 5, 9, and 15. These limitations limit the width of the "slide plate" to the same width as the truck mounting bases. Applicant believes that Examiner may have intended to include the reduction in the width of the slide plate in the rejection at page 3, paragraph 3, of the office action.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Rodriguez' patent (US 2,200,935). The Applicant respectfully seeks to traverse the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant argues that the Rodriguez patent (U.S. 2,200,935) does not teach a skateboard with a "slide plate" having a protective, consistent, and unobtrusive bottom between the two trucks. Rather, Rodriguez teaches a scooter with a stringer attached at multiple points to the board to provide lengthwise support to the board. As compared to a skateboard with a "slide plate," the scooter taught by Rodriguez has a "stringer" attached to the board at several points between the two trucks that provides an inconsistent, obtrusive bottom surface between the two trucks and disrupts the integrity of the deck.

The term "slide plate" as used in claims 1, 8, and 14 is well defined in the specification of the current invention entitled "Slide Plate for a Skateboard." The definition of a "slide plate" as described provides for a "plate attached to the bottom surface of the

Skateboard deck to provide a consistent, unobtrusive sliding or grinding surface." (Page 3, lines 15 and 16.) The use of the term "slide plate" in claims 1, 8, and 14 distinguishes the claimed invention from the stringer taught by Rodriguez. Additionally, claims 1, 8, and 14 of the current invention claim a skateboard with a slide plate (claims 1 and 8) or a slide plate for a conventional skateboard (claim 14) with the slide plate attached by the truck mounts to the deck. This means of attachment provides for a skateboard with a "slide plate" having a protective, continuous, and unobtrusive bottom surface in accordance with the objectives of the invention and the description. (Page 3, lines 9-14 and page 4, lines 1-9, respectively.)

With regard to the claims, claim 1, line 4, provides for skateboard having an elongated "slide plate" with at least one mounting hole at each end region. Claim 1, lines 7-15, provide for the slide plate being "mounted in position" between the mounting bases of the trucks and the bottom surface of the deck by the truck mounts. Likewise claim 8, lines 8-17 provides for fixing the "slide plate" into position between the truck mounting surfaces and the deck by attachment of the trucks to the deck through the mounting holes of the "slide plate." Claim 14, lines 8-10 provides for a mounting hole such that the "elongated plate" can be mounted to the bottom surface of the deck by the truck mounting bolts. Additionally, claim 14 is directed to "a slide plate for use on a conventional skateboard . . . the slide plate comprising . . . " (Claim 14, lines 1 and 5-6.) A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the use of the term "slide plate" in claims 1, 8, and 14 and its attachment to the deck by the truck mounting surfaces provides for a skateboard with a protective, consistent, and unobtrusive bottom surface between the two trucks, a structural limitation not taught by Rodriguez.

The teachings of Rodriguez in regard to the stringer are vague. By definition a stringer is a horizontal member that provides lengthwise support; thus, Rodriguez teaches a lengthwise support member that raises the board with respect to the wheels (page 1, column 2, lines 2-5). The stringer taught by Rodriguez has additional attachment points to the board (as compared to a slide plate) that anchor the stringer to the board to provide support and an inconsistent, obtrusive bottom surface. The disclosure of Rodriguez provides implicitly for attachment of the stringer to the board by the truck mounting plates (18, 19) (Fig. 1 and 2) which can be attached to the board by bolts or screws (page 1, column 2, lines 7-10). Rodriguez also provides for attachment of the stringer by: 1) the strap spring (26) that is mounted to the board by two bolts (27) (Fig. 1 and 3) (page 1, column 2, lines 41-43); and 2) the threaded bushing (20) inserted through the board and mounted by a hexagonal bolts and lock washers (21, 22) (Fig. 1 and 3) (page 1, column 1, lines 30-33). These additional attachment points provide additional support points for the stringer. The additional attachment points also result in a scooter with stringer that disrupts the integrity of the board and has an inconsistent, obtrusive bottom surface between the two trucks.

The structure described by the claims 1, 8, and 14 provides for a skateboard with a "slide plate" having a consistent, unobtrusive bottom surface that provides a protective surface and a consistent sliding surface in accordance with objectives and description of the invention. The disclosure of Rodriguez implicitly teaches attachment of the stringer to the board by the truck mounts, but it also teaches a stringer that provides has two additional attachment points to the board. The use of the term "slide plate" in claims 1, 8, and 14 and attachment of the slide plate to the deck by the truck mounting surfaces distinguishes the

claimed invention from the teachings of Rodriguez. A skateboard with a "slide plate" having a consistent, unobtrusive surface that spans the bottom of the deck between the trucks and protects the integrity of the deck is not taught by Rodriguez. Rodriguez teaches a stringer attached to the board at several points between the trucks that results in a scooter with a stringer having an inconsistent, obtrusive bottom surface and attachments that disrupt the integrity of the deck.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 10, and 16 stand rejected based on the proposition that resilient plastics are well known in the manufacturing arts and it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the stringer of Rodriguez (US 2,200,935) from resilient plastic to provide a stringer that is lightweight and has high impact strength, thus improving the life-span of the chassis.

Claims 3, 11, 17, and 18 stand rejected based on the proposition that it is well known to adjust the thickness of the structural members of designed mechanism to meet a specific requirement, such as height. As such, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the thickness of the stringer of Rodriguez (US 2,200,935) for purposes of achieving a particular height of the platform above the ground surface.

Claims 6, 9, and 16 stand rejected based on the proposition that it is well known to decrease the size of manufactured elements for purposes of using lesser quantities of material. As such, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the

length of the manufactured elements (stringer of Rodriguez '147) for the purpose of using lesser quantities of material.

The applicant respectfully seeks reconsideration of the above listed claims on the grounds that the limitation of claims 1, 8, and 14 from which they depend are patentably distinguishable from the teachings of Rodriguez (US 2,200,935). Applicant refers to the prior argument regarding the use of the term "slide plate" in claims 1, 8, and 14 and the attachment of the slide plate to the deck by the mounting bases of the trucks. The claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, the claims 9-11 depend from claim 8, and the claims 15-18 depend from claim 14.

Applicant respectfully seeks reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-6, claims 9-11, and claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant has addressed each of the Examiner's rejections. If this reply is found to be incomplete, or a telephone conference can help advance this application, please telephone the undersigned at 202-363-1844.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date 01-03-2003 William C. Ronnenberg Jr. 48,693

William C. Ronnenberg Jr., Reg. No. 48,693

2950 Van Ness Street NW #603

Washington, DC 20008

(202) 363-1844